



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Advocate of Peace

VOL. LXXVIII

JUNE, 1916

NUMBER 6

## AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY REORGANIZED

THE Eighty-eighth Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society was held in Washington on May 13. Official records pertaining to the meeting appear elsewhere in these pages. It will be noted that fundamental changes in the organization of the Society have been adopted. The group known as Directors at Large has been abolished. There is now but one grade of Directors, some of whom represent the divisions of the Society and others such organizations as the Church Peace Union, the Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, the American School Peace League. Direct memberships in the American Peace Society are no longer possible. Members can no longer vote at an annual meeting of the whole Society, as heretofore. Members will hereafter vote in the divisions to which they belong. The classes of memberships have been changed to six in number, as follows: Annual members, with dues not less than \$1; sustaining members, with dues not less than \$5; contributing members, not less than \$25; life members, not less than \$100; in-

stitutional members, not less than \$25, and honorary members.

The unit of organization is at present the division which is practically the American Peace Society within a State. When completed the American Peace Society will, therefore, have at least forty-eight divisions. It is provided that each division shall organize itself into sections, and that the Board of Directors may group the divisions into departments. The Executive Committee has been changed from nine to fifteen members, to be composed of the President, Secretary, Treasurer, six other members of the Board of Directors, and six other members of the Society who may or may not be members of the Board of Directors. Inspired by the history of the Red Cross, a committee has been appointed for the purpose of studying the recommendation of the Secretary that the American Peace Society be reorganized under a Government act to the end that it may carry on its construction work logically with Government co-operation.

## COLONEL ROOSEVELT—PACIFIST

COL. ROOSEVELT, your address in the city of Detroit on May 19 is the expression of a sincere American. We are perfectly willing to agree that you are not speaking in the interest of any man and, least of all, of yourself. Also, we are perfectly willing to agree that there are "certain great principles which should be fundamental in this giant democratic Commonwealth of ours." It is true that Mr. Ford has been victorious in the Michigan primary for the selection of delegates to the Republican National Convention, and that he has shown marked popular strength in Nebraska and Pennsylvania. We are inclined to agree with you that Mr. Ford's supporters in the primaries seemingly come chiefly from the workingmen, the pacifists, and the German-Americans. You must agree that these three classes of persons constitute a very large and a very intelligent section of our American people.

We cannot agree that these men are to our era what the Tories were to the Revolutionary days, or the Copperheads to the middle of the last century. Your statement that the Copperheads included all the pacifists of their day is inaccurate. The officers of the American Peace Society, for example, during the Civil War were

all sympathizers with the North. Your ideas of a pacifist are founded in a pure misconception. You make a straw man, attribute to it various undesirable qualities, such as "craven," "coward," "poltroon," "eunuch," you call it a pacifist, and then proceed to hold it up to public ridicule. This is improper and unjust.

We agree with you that the issue is that we be prepared "with the sane and lofty idealism to fit ourselves to render great service to mankind." We agree with you, further, "that the only right principle is to prepare thoroughly or not at all," and we are willing to accept at its face your statement that you are "advocating preparedness so as to avoid war." We are inclined to thank you for emphasizing that full preparedness "is not only military, but at least as much industrial and social." In short, we are glad when you place yourself flatly upon the platform of the pacifist. It is not true that the pacifists subscribe to any "ignoble submission to wrong," and we do not teach "that peace stands above righteousness." Our contention is that war is subversive of righteousness and is in itself a most woeful submission to wrong. We note that you are trying to overcome war. You are, therefore, a pacifist.

We do not understand your statement that the government has "absolutely refused in the smallest degree to prepare during these twenty-two months of world cataclysm." The government, through the speeches of our President and the most elaborate work of its committees, is about to provide the most stupendous army and navy expenditures of any peaceful nation throughout history. Your statement that there has been no "real and resolute opposition" to the pacifists sounds also to us very strange. It is, after such unsupported statements, that we are led to believe that what you call "the essential immorality" does not lie with us avowed pacifists.

You believe that the most certain way for us to insure peace is to be prepared for war. We do not believe that. We are opposed to military preparedness; but we include in this opposition all of the nations of the world. We are looking forward to the day when you will grasp this distinction and do justice to the rest of us pacifists. We quite agree with you that "we must make this nation as strong as are its convictions in reference to right and wrong." In our way we, too, are trying to bring this thing to pass. It is true that "national ideals amount to nothing if the nation lacks the power to maintain them against opposition." We are trying to overcome

the opposition. It so happens that we have, with the power at hand, maintained our ideals against the opposition of Germany upon two great occasions, and that Germany now grants that we have been the victors.

You must say, therefore, that it is not our policy to "remain helpless," but quite the contrary. Has it not occurred to you that our serious troubles with Villa have been due to the fact that that bandit considered himself "prepared"? Your opposition to "note writing" does not square with your own behavior at the time of the Russo-Japanese war, at the time of our crisis with Germany over Venezuela, and upon other occasions. We are not surprised that you look to Germany as your model; but her present plight does not overimpress us with the wisdom of her system. We are grateful to you for acknowledging that there are "pork-barrel methods in the army and navy yards." We agree with you heartily that preparedness for national power does not consist "wholly in guns and ships and armed men."

We repeat, Col. Roosevelt, that you are a pacifist. Indeed, you have done big things for peace. We welcome you. We are looking forward to the day when you will understand the rest of us, and consequently think of us a bit more kindly.

## COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE

IT is a conspicuous fact, and in the light of history a disquieting fact, that we in the United States of America find ourselves obliged to listen to the frequent and seriously intended arguments of distinguished American citizens for the adoption in our country of some European military system. Some favor the German system, some the Swiss. Our press, especially of the eastern States, generally approves of some form of conscription, which means compulsory service. New York State is indeed passing a compulsory military training bill which drafts into military training each year all unemployed boys, which means all school boys, of sixteen, seventeen, eighteen, and nineteen years of age. Many, though not all, of our army officers and military experts seem to favor for this country some form of compulsory military service.

It seems to be true that the people of our country do not sense the seriousness of this new attack upon the foundations of our nation. Representative Towner, of Iowa, speaking in the House of Representatives, March 20, said:

"None of the advocates of universal compulsory military service seem disposed to discuss the effects of the adoption of such a system by the United States. Before the present war, Germany with such a system maintained a standing army on a peace footing of 688,000 men. France maintained an army of 616,000 men. If the compulsory system

in France, with a population of 40,000,000, keeps 616,000 men in arms, such a system in the United States would keep 1,500,000 men in arms."

The conclusions of the Congressman were correct, because, under a universal system of conscription, the number in the army must be based upon the population, for the reason that a selected compulsory military service is, in a democracy, ethically unwarrantable. It is true that a prominent publicist seriously suggested to us the other day the advisability of requiring military service of our colored population only, but the suggestion does not seem particularly magnanimous or promising.

In spite of this fad or cult of conscription, we do not believe that, save possibly in a case of actual war, this country can be led to adopt compulsory military service. Even during our Civil War exemptions and substitutions were so common that the draft in the North had little effect save to quicken the volume of bounties.

The proposition carries with it a form of militarism of the most pronounced and threatening type. The hope of our world is to be found in the institutions of law and order, which institutions depend, in turn, for their growth, upon a finer and saner democracy. This finer democracy can evolve only out of that finer mental and moral development which compulsory military service is especially devised to thwart. Freedom of conscience,